

Date: Fri, 6 Aug 93 04:30:09 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #286
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Fri, 6 Aug 93 Volume 93 : Issue 286

Today's Topics:

 Call sign snobbery
 Code/NoCode
 Please E-mail any Flames
 Real CBers
 STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep!
 Use of Autopatch with College Audio Conferencing Brridge?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 5 Aug 1993 18:18:53 GMT
From: news.cerf.net!usc!math.ohio-state.edu!darwin.sura.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
eddie.mit.edu!news.mtholyoke.edu!nic.umass.edu!noc.near.net!jericho.mc.com!fugu!
levine@@pravda.sdsc.edu
Subject: Call sign snobbery
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>
> A E 5 E
> 5+3 + 1+3 + 9+3 + 1+7 = 32 units. Not bad.
>
> /JBL KD10N (= 9+3+7+3+17+3+11+3+5+7 = 68)
> ex-N1MNF (= 5+3+17+3+7+3+5+3+9+7 = 62 oh well)
>=
>Nets: levin@bbn.com | "Earn more sessions by sleeving."
>pots: (617)873-3463 |
>KD10N (@KB4N.NH.USA) | -- Roxanne Kowalski

Maybe a tie with David, NE5E?

Date: 5 Aug 93 13:02:38 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Code/NoCode
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>My next question, and I know I'll get flamed for it, is how exactly do the
>code exams test anything other than the ability to copy morse code? Is there
>some magical device the VEs use to measure something of the examiness (say his
>handwriting or little scribbles on the side of the page) to say "yes, this
>person will make a good ham"? If this is the case, wouldn't another type of
>exam, say a essay exam on the history of Siberia, do the same thing? (Then
>you could get a much larger sample of the examinees handwritting.)

well, I probably shouldn't say this, but there are too many secrets and I
don't do this Cosmo says he's going to crash another bank...fortunately Cosmo
only put my real name in the FBI database and they aren't looking for me
there.

The VEs don't have the magic box, but the Educational Testing Service does and
reviews the exams after they are shipped to the FCC. The FCC can only afford
USPS parcel shipping - so that's 2 weeks lost right there - and they have to
review the computer printouts when they come back from ETS. That's why it's
6-8 weeks for the license turnaround. ETS does this under contract for other
countries as well. Their handwriting analyzer can work on samples as small as
a bank check so a 5 minute code test is more than enough samples of good copy
to do the evaluation.

And you thought your SAT scores were actually based on the answers you put on
the form when they only really needed the handwriting on the cover sheets.

well, gotta run - - newkirk's probably done fixing up that print server next
door and he won't be happy if he finds out about this posting...at least it
won't post until April 1.

Martin.Bishop@sneaker.setec-astronomy.com

Date: Wed, 04 Aug 93 11:30:51 EDT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!

wariat.org!nraven!floyd@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Please E-mail any Flames
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Well folks... I'm going to be off-line for the next 3 or 4 days
since I'm in the process of moving. Gee... better get another 610! =)
Any replies, flames, etc. to me should be sent e-mail to either:

ak842@po.cwru.edu
floyd@nraven.wariat.org

Thanks.... see all of you when I get back on-line.

73 de N8VUR

Date: 5 Aug 93 15:32:30 EDT
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Real CBers
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, system@garlic.sbs.com (Tony Pelliccio) writes:

>
>No, you don't often hear it on the air, but look at the flames you get
>on Usenet when you state your position about denying no-code operators
>access to HF bands.

Confucius (or someone who looked like him) said: "Play with
fire, get burned! Pardon my assumption, but I think the tone
of what is said, more than the content, is what often leads to
flaming replies. Outside of alt.flame, I don't recall seeing
the level of flame-baiting one observes in rec.radio.amateur.*
on any other newsgroup.

>
>The other problem we have around here is an ineffective club. Our most
>popular repeater (146.700) has NO interference committee at this time
>but yet the jammers go on, and on, and on.

I guess you could volunteer to chair a committee....

KR1S

--
jkearman@arrl.org

"I never shot a man who didn't need it." --Clayton Allison

```

>
>Tony
>
>-----
>      o      o Tony Pelliccio, KD1NR, Control Op 441.750+, ARRL VE
>      \      / system @ garlic.sbs.com                Soon W5YI VE
>      \____/
>      (oo) Cow humor. Sort of like the Far Side.
>  /|  ____ \
> / | {MTV}|| MooTV - Rockin' Bumpin' and Funkin' into the 90's
>*  ||{____}||
>  ||-----|| (And people thought my last .sig was long, ha!)
>  ^^      ^^
>-----
>
>

```

```

-----

Date: Thu, 5 Aug 1993 16:01:24 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!magnus.acs.ohio-
state.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!uwm.edu!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!uchinews!
hayward@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

```

```

In article <23pmii$t71@techbook.techbook.com>
    genew@techbook.techbook.com (Gene Wolford) writes:
:8/4/93
:
:Lucky me...NOT still waiting anymore...at last.
:Dated 7/27.
:
:NOTE:
:I called the FCC turkeys on the 28th and they claimed to know nothing!
:Waste of time calling them. Don't bother. Either too bloody lazy to look
:in the computer when I asked them or they lied, or.....?
:
:Gene
:KB6WIP
:

```

The FCC enters the license material into the computer on a Tuesday. The computer process which alphabetizes the material within district and assigns callsigns is run as an overnight batch job Wednesday night/Thursday morning. The callsign database is then updated and the licenses printed and mailed on Thursday. That is why one cannot get up to date information until Thursday.

:
:--
: Those who beat their swords into plowshares
: are destined to plow for those who don't.
: genew@techbook.COM

Depressing thought. And contrary to much of history. But as a
philosophical statement it is as good as any, I suppose.

Kristin Rachael Hayward

--

Kristin Rachael Hayward University of Maine WX9T
kristin@gandalf.umcs.maine.edu (yes, I know I didn't post from there)

Date: Thu, 5 Aug 1993 11:22:54 GMT
From: psinntp!isc-newsserver!ultb!bad1679@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Use of Autopatch with College Audio Conferencing Brridge?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Hi all,

I haven't followed the entire discussion on autopatches, so I am sorry
if this question already came up. I am registered to take a remote
class next term. This class uses computer and audio conferencing instead
of traditional classroom instruction. As it stands right now, would it
be illegal for me to use the audio bridge (for class) through my
autopatch? Or do I have to wait for new rules changes to come into
effect?

Any input is much appreciated.

Bernie nu1s/2

--

Electrical Engineering, Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester, NY
Ax25 Packet: NU1S @ WB2PSI.#WNY.NY.USA.NOAM (normal packet route)
TCP/IP: nu1s@nu1s.ampr.org [44.69.0.37]
Internet (school): bad1679@ultb.isc.rit.edu

Date: 5 Aug 93 17:36:16 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!newsrelay.iastate.edu!news.iastate.edu!
metropolis.gis.iastate.edu!willmore@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <23d03v\$quv@usenet.INS.CWRU.Edu>,
<1993Jul31.114333.16818@anomaly.sbs.com>, <23n8kp\$k3c@news.delphi.com>
Subject : Re: Code/NoCode

chdaley@news.delphi.com (CHDALEY@DELPHI.COM) writes:

>I have mentioned TRAINING a couple of times through all of this. The
>responsibility for obtaining this training rests on our (yes, yours and
>mine) shoulders. We cannot expect to sit back and wait for the disaster
>to take place before figuring out how to communicate in an emergency. We
>also cannot expect the public safety community to take us seriously unless
>we can prove that we know what we are doing.

Oh, no. Don't tell me I've gotten into another hobby which requires the
public to be informed so that they can make intelligent decisions. First
pistol and rifle shooting and now ham radio. Oh, well. What the heck,
are there any more hobbies out there that have to justify their existence
all of the time? I might as well join them now and save myself the time...

Ham radio, like martial arts training and gun ownership, requires training
and a well educated public for proper functioning. *sigh*

Cheers,
David

--

willmore@iastate.edu | "Death before dishonor" | "Better dead than greek" |
David Willmore | "Ever noticed how much they look like orchids? Lovely!" |

Date: 5 Aug 1993 11:36 EDT
From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!usc!math.ohio-state.edu!uwm.edu!linac!
uchinews!cs.umd.edu!skates.gsfc.nasa.gov!nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov!
stocker@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <Pine.3.07.9308021206.A22263-9100000@uafhp.uark.edu>,
<1993Aug2.225832.14836@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com>, <1993Aug4.175919.12220@ke4zv.uucp>ca.g
Subject : Re: Lead the Way! (was Re: code/nocode blah blah blah

[stuff deleted]

>
>Yep, that's the way it is *now*, and the pool's small too. That's what
>we're talking about, expanding the pool and shuffling the order of the

>answers, as a means to defeat rote memorization of exams. Though I've
>got to say that rote memorization of a 200 question pool impresses me
>about as much as rote memorization of dot dash patterns. I'd say learning
>the basic material so you can derive the correct answer on demand is
>easier to do.
>
>Gary
>
>--
>Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
>Destructive Testing Systems | we break it. | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
>534 Shannon Way | Guaranteed! | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
>Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | |

I generally agree with the concept of expanding the question pool and having answer order randomly generated. However, rote memorization has been (even when FCC gave) and will be part of the test. I think most of it is pretty stupid but it will go on. Some of course will be necessary. Just some examples of having to memorize:

- 1) in what ITU region does Guam reside, Mariannas, Russia, etc.
- 2) the color band and order for resistor identification (on the old Novice test)
- 3) On what portion of the 10m band is RTTY allowed, Novice voice, etc.
- 4) What are the formulas for power, resistance, reactance, etc. Even being able to apply the formula you first have to memorize it.
- 5) What is the proper way to call CQ in CW, RTTY, etc. This is pure memorization of a procedure.
- 6) What does QSL, RST, etc mean. Again pure memorization

A lot of the test has always been rote memory. Memorization will always be part of the learning process. What we need to do is come up with an effective way to determine what absolutely needs memorization and what we can drop. I think the questions on ITU regions are inordinately stupid. I also would like to see less concern about memorizing formulas and more on the actual application of those formulas to circuits. It doesn't bother me an iota that the test would provide the formula. The key is that the test deal with the circuits. People who memorize formulas often don't know the simple algebra to transform them to solve for the different variables; they just memorize different versions of the formula. Also memorizing formulas doesn't mean that one knows how to use them properly.

Lastly, the greatest memorization test is the CW test. Because once you MEMORIZE the letters the speed of recall is the only test. Just ROTE memorization. (sorry I added this to a comment on yours Gary given your stated view on the subject - however, it did need saying).

Erich
N30XM

Date: Thu, 5 Aug 1993 16:46:34 GMT
From: overload.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu!
math.ohio-state.edu!uwm.edu!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!newsrelay.iastate.edu!
news.iastate.edu!metropolis.gis.@dog.ee.lbl.gov
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <iNcB8B7w165w@balsam.pinetree.org>, <CAxpl.J2D@mentor.cc.purdue.edu>,
<930728.115556.1v2.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com>c.edu
Subject : Re: Damn the torpedoes (was Re: 1947 No Code)

system@garlic.sbs.com (Tony Pelliccio) writes:

>> What does learning code have to do with building a satellite rig?
>> What does it have to do with setting up an antenna?
>> Not much.

>You're right. But if you ever want to get on HF, don't scream for access
>without learning the code. It's pretty simple.

Would the people in this debate please end it soon so that this no-code
who's license hasn't even come in yet can get back to studying code so
I'll be ready to test for my Extra the fall. I've got the theory for
general and advanced down and I'm working on the code and the extra class
theory. I guess taking all of those EE courses came in handy after all...

I'm not all that interested in HF, per se, but some of the properties of
the radio waves at those frequencies are interesting. (i.e. propogation)

Cheers,
David

P.S. See you on the low bands in the fall...

--

willmore@iastate.edu | "Death before dishonor" | "Better dead than greek" |
David Willmore | "Ever noticed how much they look like orchids? Lovely!" |

Date: Thu, 5 Aug 1993 17:47:15 GMT
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!
vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!newsrelay.iastate.edu!news.iastate.edu!
metropolis.gis.iastate.edu!willmore@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CAtu1A.Mrz@hpbbbrd.bbn.hp.com>,
<1993Jul29.133503.1144@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>,
<1993Jul29.180524.10944@TorreyPinesCA.ncr.com>iastate
Subject : Re: Profanity was(Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk)

kevin@TorreyPinesCA.ncr.com (Kevin Sanders) writes:
>bodoh@dggs.cr.usgs.gov (Tom Bodoh) writes:
>>knowledge of code and theory are totally seperate issues.

>Yes, they are.
>To clarify my earlier point, the removal of the code requirement has enabled
>people who are incompetent in the *theory* portion to become no-code hams.
>This is due to the theory questions being too shallow and easy to memorize
>to be an effective test of knowledge.

As a recently-passed-the-no-code person, I can easily agree that the theory was a joke. I've been involved with electronics and computers since I was a small child and to my best recollection, I could have passed that 'theory' test when I was 10. If I had studied for the questions, I could have done it earlier. Now, I'm studying for the extra theory exam. Some of the material on the advanced test looks a little interesting, but not too tough. I'd be all for making the theory more difficult. The way it is now, I'll be an Extra within 6 months of the date I tested for my no-code. (That's if the code doesn't get me. ;)

>Please don't construe this as an argument to continue CW testing on HF or
>eliminate the no-code license; the proper "fix" is to beef up the theory
>tests. With the theory tests as easy as they are however, the CW test is
>the only means we have to filter out the chuff. Once the theory tests have
>been beefed up, I would be behind removal of all CW requirements. But not
>before.

I would agree that the CW requirement be removed, but I'm going to learn it anyway. After all, if I want to talk to the people on HF, I'll have to learn to speak their language. If I want to talk on phone, I'll use (VU)HF.

Cheers,
David
--

willmore@iastate.edu | "Death before dishonor" | "Better dead than greek" |

David Willmore | "Ever noticed how much they look like orchids? Lovely!" |

Date: 5 Aug 1993 16:23:22 GMT

From: olivea!news.bbn.com!bbn.com!levin@ames.arpa

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CB857D.I7A@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <1993Aug4.200213.13193@ke4zv.uucp>,
<23puoj\$79r@news.delphi.com>

Subject : Re: Code/NoCode

chdaley@news.delphi.com (CHDALEY@DELPHI.COM) writes:

|Your question is a good one and I am not sure of the answer. It is
|certainly true that ARES and RACES are not new creations. It is also true
|that I have heard IN THIS NEWSGROUP that "ARES is a joke." This might
|suggest that those who have been filling the shoes have gotten up and left.
|Or it may also mean that the shoes have been empty for some time.

It might suggest that a Usenet newsgroup is not the gold standard of
informed opinion. This is especially so, when you consider who made
that remark (if my memory serves, which it sometimes does).

/J

=

Nets: levin@bbn.com | "Earn more sessions by sleeving."

pots: (617)873-3463 |

KD10N (@KB4N.NH.USA) |

-- Roxanne Kowalski

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #286
